Mooring and anchorage areas
JPA Section 5

- Public Notification – HRCP will provide addressed labels
  - USACE: Adjacent to the project site
  - VADEQ: ½ mile up/down Stream
JPA Section 6

- Threatened and Endangered Species Information
- Appendix I: Federal Species
- NMFS Jurisdictional Species Determination
  - Species with “No Effect” Determination
    - Hawksbill Sea Turtle
    - Shortnose Sturgeon
    - North Atlantic Right Whale
  - Species with “May Affect, but Not Likely to Adversely Affect” Determination
    - Sea Turtles (Loggerhead, Kemp’s Ridley, Green, and Leatherback)
    - Atlantic Sturgeon
    - Fin Whale
- USFWS Jurisdictional Species
  - Piping Plover
  - Bald Eagle
  - Golden Eagle
- No TOYR

JPA Section 6

- Appendix J: State Species
- No Adverse Effects
- VAFWIS Search Report and VDCR Natural Heritage Report
  - Northern long-eared bat (Myostis septentrionalis) (State Threatened)
  - Tricolored bat (Perimyotis subflavus) (State Endangered)
  - Northeastern beach tiger beetle (Cicindela dorsalis) (State threatened)
  - Gull billed tern (Sterna nilotica) (State Threatened)
  - Piping plover (Charadrius melodus) (no critical habitat at HRBT, State threatened)
  - Red knot (Calidris canutus rufa) (State threatened)
  - Peregrine Falcon (Falco peregrinus) (state threatened)
  - Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus) (endangered)
  - Shortnose sturgeon (Acipenser brevirostrum) (endangered)
  - Green sea turtle (Chelonia mydas) (State threatened)
  - Loggerhead sea turtle (Caretta caretta) (State threatened)
  - Kemp’s ridley sea turtle (Lepidochelys kempii) (State endangered)
  - Hawksbill sea turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata) (State endangered)
  - Leatherback sea turtle (Dermochelys coriacea) (State endangered)
  - Canebrake rattlesnake (Crotalus horridus) (State Endangered)
  - Mabee’s salamander (Ambystoma mabeei) (State Threatened)
JPA Section 6

- Appendix M: Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Assessment
  - Atlantic Herring
  - Atlantic Butterfish
  - Black Sea Bass
  - Bluefish
  - Cobia
  - Summer Flounder and Windowpane Flounder
  - King Mackerel and Spanish Mackerel
  - Red Drum
  - Red Hake
  - Scup
  - Atlantic Sharpnose, Sandbar, Dusky, and Sand Tiger Shark
  - Winter, Little, and Clearnose Skate

- Anadromous Fish
  - River Herring (Alewife, blueback)
  - Shad (American shad, hickory)
  - Striped Bass
  - White Perch

- No TOYR

- Habitat Condition Assessment and Mitigation

JPA Section 6

- Appendix R: Marine Mammals
  - Fin Whale (rare)
  - Common Minke Whale (rare)
  - Humpback Whale (regular)
  - North Atlantic Right Whale (rare)
  - Common Bottlenose Dolphin (regular)
  - Harbor Porpoise (regular)
  - Harbor Seal (regular)
  - Grey Seal (regular)

- Potential Effects on Marine Mammals
  - Noise (In-Air and Underwater)
  - Habitat Loss and Alteration
  - Prey Availability and Habitat
  - Sedimentation

- Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA)
  - Level B
  - Level A

- Letters of Authorization (LOA)
Appendix K: Cultural and Historic Resources Information

- FHWA and VDOT have complied with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800
- Programmatic Agreement (PA) requires VDOT to meet specific design commitments for avoidance of adverse effects within the Area of Potential Effect (APE)

Commitments in the Programmatic Agreement

- No permanent acquisition of property from Hampton University
- Memorandum of agreement outlining terms for temporary Hampton University property
- Emancipation Oak: No encroachment into the Tree Limit of Disturbance
  - Baseline Assessment & Monitoring Plan
- Noise Barriers
  - Hampton Institute Historic District & Hampton Institute National Historic Landmark
  - Pasture Point Historic District
  - Hampton National Cemetery
  - Phoebus–Mill Creek Terrace Neighborhood Historic District
  - Norfolk Naval Base Historic District

Appendix G: Impacts

- WOUS Impact Tables
  - Summary of Impacts by Segment and Type
  - Fill Impacts
  - Shading Impacts
  - Pile Impacts
  - Dredging Impacts
  - Extended Temporary (>6 mo) Trestles
  - Temporary (< 6mo) Impacts

- Impact Drawings
  - Location and footprint of each numbered site

- Design Plans
Appendix P: Avoidance Minimization and Mitigation Plan

- Immersed Tube Tunnel vs. Bored Tunnel
  - Avoid substantial in-water impacts, and avoid direct navigation impacts to the federal channel.
- Temporary Construction Trestles
- Minimization by Impact Area
- Supporting Documents
  - HCA
  - 2018 Benthic Survey
  - Mitigation Plan

Proposed Compensatory Mitigation

- Compensatory Mitigation Sources Proposed for Project
  - Subaqueous credits (LRRT)
  - Oyster reef credits (LRRT)
  - Tidal vegetated wetland credits (mitigation banks; LRRT, VARTF)
  - VMRC Clam Seeding
  - Non-tidal vegetated wetlands (pre-purchased credits)
## Proposed Compensatory Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Compensation Required (Credits)</th>
<th>Availability of Potential Compensation Source(s)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tidal Subaqueous and Non-vegetated Converted to Upland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>subaqueous restoration/rehabilitation (LRRT)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clam beds</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>VMRC clam seeding</td>
<td>To be negotiated with VMRC</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV beds</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>oyster reef (LRRT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidal Vegetated, mudflats, sandy shore</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>Tidal vegetated wetland credits (LRRT, banks, VARTF)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>no compensation proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine Emergent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine Forested</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>non-tidal wetland credits pre-purchased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine Scrub Shrub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palustrine Unconsolidated Bottom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Perennial, Riverine</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&gt;5,500</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JPA Section 13

- **Section 13: Free Standing Mooring Piles, Osprey Nesting Poles, Mooring Buoys, and Dolphins main points**
- **Appendix E: Project Description, Section 2 Marine Operations**
  - 42" Mooring Piles
  - Mooring Dolphins – Three 24" Piles
  - Vessels:
    - Tug Boats
    - Barge/Transport Vessels
    - Workboats
JPA Section 15

- Shoreline stabilization structures
- Replacement bulkheads at the Willoughby Spit Property
- Rock perimeter protection around the North and South Islands

JPA Section 16

- Beach nourishment
### JPA Section 17 - Dredging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cubic Yards</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Island</td>
<td>152,000</td>
<td>715,000</td>
<td>16.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Island</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge Area #1</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>204,290</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge Area #2</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>204,290</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge Area #3</td>
<td>49,643</td>
<td>49,643</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge Area #4</td>
<td>7,434</td>
<td>7,434</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipwreck Debris removal</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>38,768</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>1,171,197</td>
<td>26.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Dredging Diagram](image-url)
Table 1-1
Source and Volume of Material to be Removed and Managed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Source</th>
<th>Material Description</th>
<th>Estimated Material (dry tons)</th>
<th>Recalculated Material (m³)</th>
<th>Incentivized Material (m³)</th>
<th>Amount and Percent of Incentivized Material</th>
<th>Actual Material (dry tons)</th>
<th>Total/Percent Incentivized Material (m³)</th>
<th>Reasonable Volume (dry tons)</th>
<th>Disposal Cost per Source Material (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division 1</td>
<td>North Island</td>
<td>336,761</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>336,761</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>998,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Island</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>881,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>641,761</td>
<td>4,697</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>641,761</td>
<td>4,697</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>1,889,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Source</th>
<th>Material Description</th>
<th>Estimated Material (dry tons)</th>
<th>Recalculated Material (m³)</th>
<th>Incentivized Material (m³)</th>
<th>Amount and Percent of Incentivized Material</th>
<th>Actual Material (dry tons)</th>
<th>Total/Percent Incentivized Material (m³)</th>
<th>Reasonable Volume (dry tons)</th>
<th>Disposal Cost per Source Material (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Island</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Island</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JPA Section 17 – Barge Routes

![Barge Routes Diagram]
JPA Section 17

- Truck Routes

JPA Section 18

- Fill – North Island Example – Cross Section B-B
JPA Section 18

- Fill – North Island Example – Cross Section B-B

JPA Section 21

- Road Crossings
  - Culvert Extension at Bay Ave
  - Appendix G, JPA Plan Set
    - Includes elevations showing the project bridges and clearances
      - North Trestle
      - South Trestle
      - Willoughby Bay
      - Bay Ave
      - Oastes Creek
Upland Stormwater Management (SWM)

- For quantity control, three SWM Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be constructed throughout the project corridor.
  - BMP-1 is located at the Mallory Street Interchange in Hampton
  - BMP-2 and BMP-4B are located at the 4th View Interchange in Norfolk
- All SWM facilities for this project will discharge to existing outfall locations throughout the corridor and no new outfalls are proposed for upland SWM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island Outfall</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Island (south side) existing outfall</td>
<td>36°59′56.00″N, 76°19′1.00″W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Island (north side) existing outfall</td>
<td>36°59′8.00″N, 76°18′16.00″W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Island (north side) new outfall</td>
<td>37° 0′11.30″N, 76°19′10.45″W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Island TAS outfall</td>
<td>37° 0′5.11″N, 76°19′11.37″W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Island TAS outfall</td>
<td>36°58′59.02″N, 76°18′16.47″W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island Outfall</th>
<th>Required Design Discharge Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Island (south side) existing outfall</td>
<td>25 CFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Island (north side) existing outfall</td>
<td>60 CFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Island (north side) new outfall</td>
<td>35 CFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North island TAS outfall*</td>
<td>7.9 MGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South island TAS outfall*</td>
<td>7.9 MGD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This discharge rate for each tunnel outfall considers 1 pump running at full capacity for the design storm (100-yr) and assuming fire suppression is in operation concurrently.
JPA Section 23

- Point source discharge of construction process water
- Characterized as Industrial Minor
- Flow rate <0.5 MDG
- Two planned outfalls 001 and 002
  - 001 South Island
    - Water treatment from
      - Jet Grouting – construction
      - Slurry Wall - construction
      - Excavation water of tri-cell (Pit for TBM entry) north bore
      - TBM boring of tunnels
  - 002 North Island
    - Water treatment from
      - Jet Grouting – construction
      - Slurry Wall - construction
      - Excavation of water tri-cell for south bore of TBM

JPA Section 23

- Planned Outfall Locations
Permitting and Construction Schedule

- **JPA**
  - JPA submission – August 30, 2019
  - Anticipated public notice date September 15, 2019
  - JPA Post-Submission Follow-up – September 26, 2019
  - Anticipated permit issuance – April 2020

- **Section 408 Concurrence**
  - Public Notice
  - Package Submittal November 2019
  - Approval before April 2020

- **USCG Bridge Permit**
  - Approval after Section 408

- **VPDES**

- **Construction**
  - Commence field construction activities – scheduled for April 2020
  - Project Substantial Completion – July 2025

Comments/Questions?
Meeting Minutes

1. Welcome & Opening Remarks

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Mr. David White. There were 28 people in attendance. Mr. White recognized the support of the Coast Guard and Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries for the committee.

2. Review and Approval of Minutes

Minutes were sent electronically prior to the meeting. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes and it passed by all in attendance.

3. Public Comments

The Chair called for any public comments. There was none.

4. Subcommittee Reports

a. Recreational Vessel Subcommittee – Subcommittee Chair Bruce Dungan had no report

b. Strategic Planning

Strategic Planning Committee chairman Capt. Whiting Chisman made a presentation (included) on the committee’s proposed strategic plan, including a new mission statement and objectives.

Mr. White notes that this plan is presented as strategic vision through 2021 providing the ability to update as necessary. It is the first part of evolution of harbor safety committee as it moves to a more robust committee.

Question – Are we sending this to the entire Harbor Safety Committee? Answer: Mr. White wants to bring it up to the group today.

Question – It sounds like this group could end up becoming a lobbying group. Is that really what the committee wants? Also, there are already a lot of videos out there put together by partner organizations, we don’t need to recreate the wheel. Answer: Intent is not to become a lobbying group. It is important to have that ability in the strategic plan as a tool or option if something comes up that warrants such action.

Comment – for Facebook, Officer Chartier from the USCG has tools and expertise that can help. Comment – Like the idea of an annual review
Comment – This is everyone’s port and it is great that everyone considers this “their port” and that we work together to use the VHSC as a sounding board for issues to help regulators handle issues. If you see a committee that is interested, jump in and help.

Motion – the Chair asked for a motion to approve the new strategic plan. Motion was made, seconded, and approved by the attendees.

Stacey Brown will send out the approved strategic plan to the full committee.

5. Presentations and Discussion Items

Chairman David White excused himself, with Will Fediw presiding as acting chairman.

a. Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel – Section 408
The HRBT Project will be the largest Marine Project ever undertaken by VDOT, involving expansion of the existing trestle/tunnel system with over 10 miles of construction, and $3.8 Billion Dollars. The agreement was signed April 2019, procurement contingent on permits December 2019 and with completion planned for November 2025.

Current construction partners include Dragados (Spanish), VINCI (French), and FlatIron, each with different, but important construction capabilities. Application for permits have been submitted with public notice expected in about a week. Input is being sought from any/all maritime and/or waterfront dependent users, who navigate/operate in the Norfolk Reach, Hampton Flats or Willoughby Bay or adjacent channels.

b. Hurricane Season
Jeff Orrock with the National Weather Service provided a presentation on Dorian Review and the Hurricane Season Outlook. This is forecasted to be an above average hurricane season for eastern US and the Atlantic. The forecast for Dorian from the National Hurricane Center was good. They now have a meteorologist embedded in Richmond in the Virginia Department of Emergency Management. There was a little confusion about water levels – the National Hurricane Center had different numbers than Wakefield – they use a different way to describe water levels.

Captain Stevens thanked NWS Wakefield for their continued coordination for hurricane preparedness. The Captain of the Port has a challenge in deciding when to close the port to balance caution for the waterway for the uses of the waterway. The coordination very early in the forecast provided plenty of time to react. Before reopening the port, ATONs have to be evaluated right after the storm so that the port can open as quickly as possible. Port Search and Rescue (SAR) is very limited during a hurricane event because assets have been moved to ride out the storm.

Question – When reopening a port, can we do it in stages? Allowing commercial first and then recreational? Captain of Port has to look at priority of vessels. We need to work on communication to rec boaters.

Question – How does a person know that the port is open or closed? Marine safety bulletins are a good source of information and the District 5 Media resources releases information about port closures.
6. Agency Briefs - USCG
Prevention/Waterways – Currently conducting a Waterways Analysis (WAMS) of the James River. They have received no feedback to date, but hoping to get more. Will be working on a WAMS for the entrance to Chesapeake Bay. The study looks at ATONs along with other items. The USCG is looking for feedback. The comment period for the James River is November 16th. The comment period for the Chesapeake Bay Entrance ends December 16th.


Command Center – had 53 SAR notifications.

Navy – New players in Navy and appreciate interaction with port partners.

Army Corps of Engineers – nothing to report

DGIF – Legislation season will be upon us soon. Will let the group know of any legislation of importance. Our agency did update the life jacket regulation so it is now in concert with the Federal Code requirements for life jackets.

7. Unfinished Business (from previous meetings)
   a. James River Waterways and Management Assessment – already report on
   b. Changes to National Weather Service Alerts - nothing to report; no changes yet

8. Closing Remarks
   a. Next meeting date December 3, 10, 17?
Comprehensive Agreement between Commonwealth of Virginia and Hampton Roads Connector Partners (HRCP) signed in April 2019.

HRCP CJV Partners: Dragados, VINCI Construction, Flatiron Constructors, Dodin Campenon Bernard.

HRBT Expansion project is a design-build project.

Designers: HDR and Mott MacDonald.

Project Cost: $3.8 Billion.

Scheduled Completion Date: November 2025.
Project Scope

**By the numbers**

**Tunnels**
- Length: 8,000 ft
- Inner Diam.: 41.5 ft
- Excavation: 956,000 CY
- Segmental Lining: 119,000 CY
- Ground Improv.: 494,000 CY

**Structures**
- Bridges to Demo: 5
- Bridges to Build: 4
- Bridges to Widen: 23
- Total Length: 38,800 ft
- Total Surface: 2,086,000 SF

**Roadway**
- Excavation: 127,000 CY
- Embankment: 91,000 CY
- Noise Walls: 727,000 SF
- Retaining Walls: 101,000 SF

**Islands Expansion**
- Footprint: 860,000 SF
- Fill: 169,000 CY
- Dike: 188,000 CY
- Armor Stone: 351,000 Tons
- Splash Wall: 6,000 CY

**Scope**
- Demolish & Replace:
  - Mallory
  - North Trestles
  - South Trestles
- Widening & Rehab:
  - Roadway
  - Other bridges

**Tunnels**
- Length: 8,000 ft
- Inner Diam.: 41.5 ft
- Excavation: 956,000 CY
- Segmental Lining: 119,000 CY
- Ground Improv.: 494,000 CY

**Structures**
- Bridges to Demo: 5
- Bridges to Build: 4
- Bridges to Widen: 23
- Total Length: 38,800 ft
- Total Surface: 2,086,000 SF

**Islands Expansion**
- Footprint: 860,000 SF
- Fill: 169,000 CY
- Dike: 188,000 CY
- Armor Stone: 351,000 Tons
- Splash Wall: 6,000 CY
Design-Build: Structures

Demolish and Build North & South Trestles

Widen 6 Existing Concrete Structures (Over Water)

Widen 17 Existing Steel Structures (Over Land)

Typical 4 lanes cross section

+ Mallory Bridge

Design-Build: Tunnels

Internal Diameter: 41 ft-6 in
Structural Lining Thickness: 18 in

December 19, 2019
Design-Build: Island Expansion

North Island
715,000 ft²

South Island
145,000 ft²

- Red line shows toe of the slope of island expansion
- 100’ minimum distance offset with Hampton Creek Approach Channel

Design-Build: Roadway

- Widening of 2 lanes each direction (3rd lane + 4th High Occupancy Toll lane)
- Addition of Retaining Walls
- Addition of Sound Walls

- High importance on MOT phasing  (Management of Traffic)
## Project Schedule

### Anticipated JPA Approval Date = NTP
- 540 days (18 months) after LNTP1
- = October 2020

### Substantial Completion
- Contractual - Substantial Completion Deadline
  - 09/01/25
- Contractual - Final Completion Deadline
  - 11/01/25

### Contract Execution + LNTP1
- 04/15/19

### LNTP2 + LNTP3
- 9 months after LNTP 1
- = January 2020

### 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2025
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
LNTP 1 | | | | | | | Design and Investigation Works for Environmental Permitting

### LNTP 2
- 6 MONTH OF SCOPE VALIDATION

### LNTP 3
- LNTP2 : Authorization for TBM Procurement
- LNTP3 : Launching Pit Construction to start

### Permanent Works over 55 months
- Launch & Receiving pit ready for TBM
- TBM Assembly and Mining
- Interior Works Tunnels
- Commissioning and Testing
- North & South Marine Trestles
- Land Works I-64 Widening

---

**North Trestle & North Island**

---

![North Trestle & North Island Diagram]
- Existing channels and anchorages
- The dashed red line denotes a buffer around the federal channel and anchorage
- 100’ minimum distance offset with Hampton Creek Approach Channel
Construction Methods: Temporary Trestle

Mooring Points – 42in Steel Pipe/Piles

Mooring Points 4'

Construction Methods: Mooring Areas

Mooring Points 4'

376 of 560

December 19, 2019
Bored Tunnel Alignment between existing North and South Islands along a refined alignment

The red line denotes the Limit of Disturbance (LOD)

The red delineated area is the area of potential ground improvement
Construction Methods: Jet Grouting

Proposed alignment for the bored tunnel between existing North and South Islands

Stakeholder Relations

Waterway User Survey

- Postcard notifications being mailed this week to waterway users within a 3-nautical mile radius of the project.

- Marine stakeholders included in the survey include: Boat Ramps, Boat Repair Facilities, Commercial Fishing, Marinas, Industrial/Commercial Ports, and Military Ports.

- Data supplied by waterway users will be used by HRCP to supplement the USCG Bridge Permit Application and the USACE Section 408 Permit for the purpose of navigation clearances and safety.

- 30-question online survey will be accessible through October 7th
# Meeting Summary

**Project:** I-64 Hampton Roads Bridge-Tunnel (HRBT) Expansion  
**Meeting Title:** USCG Sector Hampton Roads  
**Date:** 18 September 2019 1300 to 1530  
**Location:** USCG Sector Hampton Roads  
4000 Coast Guard Blvd  
Portsmouth, VA 23703

## Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USCG (1)</td>
<td>CAPT Sam Stevens</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>(757) 439-5469</td>
<td><a href="mailto:samson.c.stevens@uscg.mil">samson.c.stevens@uscg.mil</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCG (2)</td>
<td>CDR Jennifer Stockwell</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>(757) 398-6389</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jennifer.a.stockwell@uscg.mil">jennifer.a.stockwell@uscg.mil</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCG (3)</td>
<td>CDR Dean Horton</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>(757) 274-7745</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dean.e.horton@uscg.mil">dean.e.horton@uscg.mil</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCG (4)</td>
<td>LT Jerimiah Mims</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCG</td>
<td>LTJG Julie Delesandri</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td><a href="mailto:julie.n.delesandri@uscg.mil">julie.n.delesandri@uscg.mil</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCG (5)</td>
<td>CWO Daniel Butierries</td>
<td>DGB</td>
<td>(757) 638-6637</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daniel.g.butierries@uscg.mil">daniel.g.butierries@uscg.mil</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCG (6)</td>
<td>CWO Jason Brisson</td>
<td>JB</td>
<td>(757) 274-7745</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jason.m.brisson@uscg.mil">jason.m.brisson@uscg.mil</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCG (7)</td>
<td>MSTD Ryan Chartier</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>(757) 668-5582</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ryan.t.chartier@uscg.mil">ryan.t.chartier@uscg.mil</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCG (8)</td>
<td>Jerry Barnes</td>
<td>JRB</td>
<td>(757) 398-6231</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jerry.R.Barnes@uscg.mil">Jerry.R.Barnes@uscg.mil</a></td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOT</td>
<td>Jim Utterback</td>
<td>JU</td>
<td>(757) 858-6778</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james.utterback@vdot.virginia.gov">james.utterback@vdot.virginia.gov</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRCP</td>
<td>Jose Martin Allos</td>
<td>JMA</td>
<td>(404) 702-1030</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmartinealos@hrcpjv.com">jmartinealos@hrcpjv.com</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRCP</td>
<td>David Barrier</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>(514) 663-9198</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbARRIER@hrcpjv.com">dbARRIER@hrcpjv.com</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRCP/I-64 DJV</td>
<td>Doug Gaffney</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>(856) 924-3363</td>
<td><a href="mailto:douglas.gaffney@mottmac.com">douglas.gaffney@mottmac.com</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRCP/I-64 DJV</td>
<td>Angela Stowe</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>(845) 216-3052</td>
<td><a href="mailto:angela.stowe@hdrinc.com">angela.stowe@hdrinc.com</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRCP/I-64 DJV</td>
<td>JP Magron</td>
<td>JPM</td>
<td>(212) 671-0180</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JP.Magron@hdrinc.com">JP.Magron@hdrinc.com</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRCP/WRA</td>
<td>Emily Drahos</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>(804) 327-5227</td>
<td><a href="mailto:edrahos@wrallp.com">edrahos@wrallp.com</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 DJV/TPG (9)</td>
<td>Paul Lattanzi</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>(207) 808-9846</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.r.lattanzi@paratusgroup.org">paul.r.lattanzi@paratusgroup.org</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 DJV/TPG (9)</td>
<td>Jamie Fessenden</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td>(925) 766-5790</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamie.fessenden@fessendenenergy.com">jamie.fessenden@fessendenenergy.com</a></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Deputy Commander, Sector Hampton Roads  
(2) Chief, Waterways, District 5  
(3) Chief, Prevention, Sector Hampton Roads  
(4) Command Center, Sector Hampton Roads  
(5) Aids to Navigation (ATON), Sector Hampton Roads  
(6) Waterways, Sector Hampton Roads  
(7) Waterways District 5  
(8) Marine Environmental Response, District 5  
(9) TPG=The Paratus Group – subconsultant to DJV
Agenda:

- Welcome/Introductions
- Meeting Objectives
- HRBT Expansion Project Overview
- Key Elements of Navigation Safety Risk Assessment and Tunnel Construction Plan
- Roundtable Discussion with USCG, HRBT Teams

Meeting Notes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Welcome/Introductions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL – Introduction to project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JU – Overview of entire project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JMA – Overview of construction and design team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS – Overview of USCG team attending meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Meeting Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL provided overview of meeting objectives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide US Coast Guard stakeholders with an overview of the HRBT Expansion Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide a common understanding of the requirements of the Navigation Safety Risk Assessment (NSRA) and Tunnel Construction Plan (TCP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Facilitate discussion between HRCP Team and operational Coast Guard personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Obtain information on how project activities could affect US Coast Guard missions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Answer any questions USCG may have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>HRBT Expansion Project Overview</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS question regarding shading of Norfolk Harbor Entrance and anchorage areas (F/G) on chart – answered by JPM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JMA explained use of land trestle on North Bridge due to shallow water depth along shoreline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS – will construction traffic use Hampton Roads Entrance Channel or transition across channel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL explained moving of navigation aid at mouth of Hampton Creek Approach Channel. JB stated that this is not a problem and he will help documentation process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS asked if US Army of Cops Engineers (USACE) dredging project to widen navigation channel includes the area of jet grouting. DG stated the current plan accounts for the widening of the channel. JB brought up need to ATON for jet grout trestle on South Island. JMA stated that HRCP would like to keep trestle in place for duration of TBM boring if it does not impact navigation (the original plan is to have the trestle in place for about a year for the jet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HRCP to provide Barge Operation Plan detailing movements of vessels
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grouting activities). SS stated he would like to better understand the traffic in the area of the jet grout trestle. PL stated that there is deep water available if it is necessary to temporarily slide channel over to accommodate jet grout trestle. JB asked about the size of the jet grout trestle. JMA gave size as 1,000 ft long for each of the two jet grout trestles running north from South Island. As such, the ends of the trestles will be about 1,000 ft away from the limits of the Norfolk Harbor Entrance Reach Channel. JS asked about depth of tunnel out of concern for dragging anchor, etc. DG and JMA explained that depth of tunnel is below current tunnel depth and covered with more than 50 ft of overburden. JMA explained that the project will have about 25 to 30 crane barges at peak. Hampton Flats would be used for anchoring of barges. Group discussion on barges, including number of total barges, the number of crane barges, the number of supply barges, and the number of barges in anchorage, as well as location of all barges. SS stated that he wants to see an overlay of barge movements against current traffic vessels’ Automatic Identification System (AIS) Data in the NRSA. For this NSRA, TPG is using the publicly-available 2017 AIS Data. JS asked how the current bridges would be demolished out of concern for debris in waterway. DB explained that the old bridges would be “deconstructed” and piles would be cut off 2’ to 3’ below mudline. Method of deconstruction will minimize any debris in waterway. DH asked about the disposition of fendering system on the Willoughby Bay Bridge. JPM stated that this would be part of the Bridge Permit Application. DH asked where the dredge material would go after delivery to waste facility. JMA stated that there would be no dumping offshore and that only approved waste facilities would be used. JMA stated further that the bridge demolition material will be used to the creation of an artificial reef by the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC). JS was very interested in the location of the reef as there are several conflicts within VA waters. JB asked if Hampton Flats anchorage would use mooring balls or anchoring. JPM stated that anchoring only, no permanent moorings are currently planned. PL added that the moorings in Willoughby Bay may need to have proper navigation lights. DH stated that the anchoring plans (location/markings) require further discussion to ensure all parties are satisfied with location and safety of location. JB stated that the Regulated Navigation Area (RNA) may restrict anchoring in Hampton Flats area. RNA goes up to the James River Bridge. However, they could modify an exemption to the RNA. SS stated that USCG would work with team to find suitable anchorage and that a good severe weather plan must be in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPG to provide overlay of expected barge movements vs. AIS data in NRSA HRCP to provide USCG/JS with reef locations HRCP to provide anchoring plan as part of Barge Operations Plan. HRCP to provide Severe Weather Plan as part of Marine Operations Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JS asked if severe weather plan was part of NSRA. DG stated that the severe weather plan is contained in the Section 408 Marine Operations Plan (MOP), not the NSRA, and is required by USACE/DEQ.

JS asked if the barges are owned by HRCP. JMA stated that the barges would rented with a contractual requirement for the owner to pick up barges and relocate them when asked by HRCP. JS asked if the barges would be surveyed out of concern for the material condition of the barges and especially the crane barges. JS recommended a marine survey.

JRB (on phone) offered the following comments:

- NSRA is required by the USCG for the USACE.
- He believes that the survey of the waterway use, including barge movements and anchorage should be presented for public comment.
- Weather plan is important and needs to include all weather, such as thunderstorms.

SS believes that it is blending the actions of the waterway survey with a public comment period. SS believes USACE should lead formal comment period after receiving NSRA as part of the 408 package. DG stated that he will discuss the public outreach requirements with USACE on 19 Sept 2019. DH expressed the importance of public outreach. JB added that USCG may need to do public outreach for temporary anchorage locations due to length of time involved.

JRB departed meeting.

JMA gave an overview of the linear construction schedule.

4. **Key Elements of Navigation Safety Risk Assessment & Tunnel Construction Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS asked about the span of time the AIS data covers. PL explained the AIS is for the entire year 2017. The 2017 data will be reviewed against the 2018 if/when available to see if there are any major changes.</td>
<td>TPG to review 2018 if/when available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Roundtable Discussion between USCG, HRBT Teams**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DH stated that his biggest concern is the anchorage area in Hampton Flats – believes that this area will be problematic. F-1 is currently an emergency anchorage. DH worries about collision at night with small recreational vessel not expecting barges anchored in area. PL stated that he does not believe that lighting up the area is a good solution as it strays from the Navigation Rules (aka. The 1972 Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea = COLREGS) and opens USCG up to liability. PL recommends following COLREGS. DH asked if the barges would have AIS. DB confirmed that barges will have AIS. JB stated that reuse of existing marked anchorages would be best to use for the project mooring area. He suggested looking the K anchorage area off of Norfolk Naval Station. The</td>
<td>HRCP to provide Barge Operations Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G anchorages are owned by the Navy and not likely a good spot. JB asked what time the barge fleeting would take place. JS then asked for a clarification on who will be anchoring. DB stated that the supply barges will be moving between project work locations to their port of loading. DB stated the anchorage area is mostly a refuge area for severe weather. DH/SS immediately stated the Hampton Flats area is not a good spot even for refuge. SS stated that the USCG will look at options and offered to reach out to the Navy to aid in the search for anchorage area. SS stated that the placement of anchorages is a thorny issue vs. waterway use. PL then suggested in the interest of time that meeting participants identify the issues they foresee for the remainder of the meeting, and any discussion of potential solutions be followed up on later. DG asked if the tunnel construction plan (TCP) should follow the framework of the High Rise Bridge Marine Operation Plan. JS/JB stated they will need to review the High Rise Bridge MOP. JPM added that the TCP, as requested by USCG, is a NSRA focused between the islands. JS stated that she will review TCP requirements with District bridge folks. SS then raised the issue of carrying the meeting forward. He suggested that key players establish a meeting and a cadence to keep all parties up to date on the project. DG added that a similar meeting was held for the 408 permitting. SS said to think of it as a standing ops brief. DG suggest that it be held monthly until April. DH/SS concurred. SS then returned to the anchorage issues. He wants to know exactly what is needed for the anchorage. He offered the USCG to help. He stated the USCG needs the barge operations plan to accomplish finding a suitable anchorage area. USCG noted that if we need to do temporary anchoring, that is a rulemaking process and would take 6-9 months. DG asked if moving ATON at the Hampton Creek Approach was difficult. JB stated that it is not difficult, and he will help. SS stated that the severe weather concern remains for him. JB – stated that Ultra Large Container Vessel (ULCV) traffic started in May 2017 (noted for use of 2017 AIS data). Currently averaging 5 transits a week. Expected to raise to 6 transit soon. Requires a 4-hour closure of the main channel with one-way traffic only. JB then spoke about the Thimble Shoal Channel dredge. The dredging will eliminate the auxiliary channels. The dredge will be in the outbound or inbound lane and could impact the ULCV traffic. Back-ups of traffic may occur. Dredging starts in 2020 and could take up to 2 years. HRCP should be aware of safety and security zones due to dredging. JS stated that USACE has ability to set up safety zones as necessary. DGB - main concern for the command center is a central point of contact for following up on distress calls from motorists. He also emphasized the importance of an open communication channel between construction team and USCG command center. DGB asked about construction hours. DB stated that there will be 24 hours/day construction taking place. Water activity is planned for daylight hours only. Night activities will be USCG to aid in finding suitable anchorage location(s). USCG to review TCP requirements JPM/DG to establish meeting HRCP to provide Barge Operations Plan HRCP to submit Barge Operations Plan to DH/USCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
limited to deck construction and in-tunnel work. Non-working Barges will not have anybody on board at night. DH stated the importance of getting the barge operations plan. DH requested the barge operation plan be submitted to him.

MSTC Chartier (RC) stated his main concern is the severe weather plan and the use of sub-contractors to move barges when securing the port due to limited resources when port closure is imminent. SS still concerned about hurricane hitting area over next 5 years. DH stated that he wants a plan for the barges during severe weather. DH suggested the southern branch of the Elizabeth River.

RC stated that he is the contact for recurring marine events in the area.

SS then stated that there are 4-5 weather events that affect the port every year. JB stated that ice was also an issue in Jan 2017 and the James River was closed due to ice flows. Shallow areas like Hampton Flats are especially susceptible to ice flows.

SS stated a concern with potential spillage of construction related items into waterway. SS asked what material(s) are being used that could potential end up on waterway. SS then wanted to know who owned the salvage/response as well as recovery. JS stated that this should be included in the operations manual used by HRCP. Concern was the need for USCG resources to address responses that would normally be handled by contractor. DB said HRCP will clarify its plan as the project is developed.

Lines of communication were discussed:

- Jerry Barnes/Hal Pitts for bridge and bridge lighting issues.
- DH will follow-up on Electronic Freedom of Information Act (eFOIA) request submitted by TPG on 04 Sept 2019.
- JB for ATON
- JB stated that Marine Incident Reporting (MIR) should be included in Marine Operations Plan.
- JB stated that coal exports pick-up in Winter. Vessels draw 49’ and usually depart at high tide. LPG exports are picking up as well.
- JB stated movement of ATON is ok and shifting channel is likely ok. He will help fill out necessary forms.

End of Meeting.
USCG Sector Hampton Roads Meeting
18 September 2019

I-64 Hampton Roads Bridge-Tunnel (HRBT) Expansion Project

Agenda

- Welcome/Introductions
- Meeting Objectives
- HRBT Expansion Project Overview
- Key Elements of the Navigation Safety Risk Assessment and Tunnel Construction Plan
- Roundtable Discussion
The Design-Build Project

- Comprehensive Agreement between Commonwealth of Virginia and Hampton Roads Connector Partners (HRCP) signed in April 2019
- HRCP CJV Partners: Dragados, VINCI Construction, Flatiron Constructors, Dodin Campenon Bernard
- HRBT Expansion project is a design-build project
- Designers: HDR and Mott MacDonald
- Project Cost: $3.8 Billion
- Scheduled Completion Date: November 2025
Introductions
Meeting Objectives

- Provide US Coast Guard stakeholders with an overview of the HRBT Expansion Project
- Provide a common understanding of the requirements of the Navigation Safety Risk Assessment (NSRA) and Tunnel Construction Plan (TCP)
- Facilitate discussion between HRCP Team and operational Coast Guard personnel
  - Obtain information on how project activities could affect US Coast Guard missions
  - Learn from Coast Guard members’ unique insight into potentially affected port partners
  - Answer any questions you may have

HRBT Expansion Project Overview

- Improvements to the I-64 corridor between Settlers Landing and I-564 (9.9 miles)
- New bridge-tunnel complex (3.5 miles) including
- Tunnel (1.7 miles) using a Tunnel Boring Method (TBM)